Volume 5

Pages 832 - 981

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BEFORE THE HONORABLE WILLIAM H. ALSUP, JUDGE

FINJAN, INC.,

Plaintiff,

VS.

No. C 17-5659 WHA

JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.,

Defendant.

San Francisco, California Friday, December 14, 2018

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff:

KRAMER, LEVIN, NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP

990 Marsh Road

Menlo Park, California 94025

BY: PAUL J. ANDRE, ESQ. LISA KOBIALKA, ESQ. JAMES HANNAH, ESQ.

KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS AND FRANKEL LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas New York, New York 10036

BY: CRISTINA LYNN MARTINEZ, ESQ.

(Appearances continued on next page)

Reported By: Katherine Powell Sullivan, CSR No. 5812, RMR, CRR

Jo Ann Bryce, CSR No. 3321, RMR, CRR

Official Reporters



APPEARANCES (CONTINUED):

For Defendant: IRELL & MANELLA LLP

1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900 Los Angeles, California 90067-4276

BY: JONATHAN S. KAGAN, ESQ.
ALAN J. HEINRICH, ESQ.
JOSHUA GLUCOFT, ESQ.
CASEY CURRAN, ESQ.

IRELL & MANELLA LLP

840 Newport Center Drive, Suite 400 Newport Beach, California 92660

BY: REBECCA CARSON, ESQ. KEVIN X WANG, ESQ.



I N D E X

Friday, December 14, 2018 - Volume 5

	PAGE	VOL.
Charging Conference	845	5
Defense Rests	864	5
Plaintiff Rests Rebuttal Case	887	5
Jury Instructions	898	5
Closing Argument by Mr. Andre	907	5
Closing Argument by Mr. Kagan	927	5
Rebuttal Argument by Mr. Andre	954	5
Final Jury Instructions	961	5
DEFENDANT'S WITNESSES	PAGE	VOL.
ORSO, ALESSANDRO (IN REBUTTAL)		
(SWORN)	865	5
Direct Examination by Mr. Hannah	865	5
Cross-Examination by Mr. Heinrich	879	5
Redirect Examination by Mr. Hannah	885	5

EXHIBITS

TRIAL EXHIBITS	<u>IDEN</u>	<u>EVID</u>	VOL.	
105		875	5	
107		875	5	
110		875	5	
125		875	5	
126		875	5	
131		875	5	



Friday - December 14, 2018

7:22 a.m.

PROCEEDINGS

3

1

2

---000---

4

(Proceedings were heard out of the presence of the jury:)

5

THE COURT: Okay. Let's get started.

6

considered your written material so the oral part will be

Okay. First we'll consider Rule 50 motions. We've

7 8

brief. Let's hear first from the defendant.

9

MR. HEINRICH: Good morning, Your Honor. Alan

10

11

Heinrich.

THE COURT: One issue at a time. So what's your first

12

issue?

13

MR. HEINRICH: So we move for JMOL on damages.

14

think it's clear from plaintiff's submission that they're

15

intent on violating the law. They're going to get up here in a

16

few minutes and they're going to present the jury with a

17

damages theory that the Federal Circuit rejected in Finjan v.

18

Blue Coat.

19

award a royalty based on a per-user or per-scan rate that's

They're going to argue to the jury that the jury should

20 21

based on nothing more than what Finjan's CEO testified Finjan

2.2

would like to get. It's contrary to law.

23

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

24

All right. Let's hear from the other side.

25

MR. ANDRE: Good morning, Your Honor. Paul Andre for



PROCEEDINGS

1 Finjan.

2.2

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. ANDRE: Your Honor, we've put in the damages case, a fact-based case, that we talked about at the pretrial conference. We were going to give the jury a lot of facts to look at, ones in which they can base a reasonable royalty on.

With respect to violating the law, we have adhered strictly to the Federal Circuit's guidelines in the $Finjan\ v$. Blue Coat case.

As I spoke to you yesterday about the apportionment issue, we have gone to great pains to apportion the Sky ATP module down to its infringing components. That's taking out over 60 percent of the value of Sky ATP.

So we have --

THE COURT: Wait. Wait. Sky ATP and the module. Where did you take anything out for the other functions of the hardware?

MR. ANDRE: For the SRX?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ANDRE: Well, Your Honor, the apportionment for SRX can be -- the Sky ATP can be attributed to the SRX or they can find damages on Sky ATP alone. We have a claim in this case for Sky ATP by itself without SRX. So at the very least the jury can find damages on Sky ATP infringement by itself, and we have apportioned that.



DOCKET

Explore Litigation Insights



Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time** alerts and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.

